



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,515	06/01/2001	Wolfgang Otter	7781.0029-00	1508

22852 7590 09/18/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/872,515	OTTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/3/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 7/3/06.
2. Claims 16 – 34 are pending in the case. Claims 16, 24 and 26 are independent.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on 5/22/06 and 7/3/06 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- Handwritten: 9/14/06
5. Claims 16, 19 – ³⁴~~30~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turpin et al. (US 5745712 A) and further in view of Eskridge et al. (US 6597381 B1).
 6. **Regarding independent claim 16**, Turpin et al. teach that *in a preferred embodiment, value trees select a conclusion based on the first condition that is*

*satisfied. For simplicity to the user, however, the conditions are typically positioned in the order that they should be evaluated. In the preceding example, for instance, the condition >20 should be the first condition in the value tree (Column 24, lines 9 – 17) as illustrated in Figs 36A-B, which meet the limitation of **the logic view including nodes representing the layout items and, the position of the nodes defining a processing order of the layout items.***

*Turpin et al. teach that *the properties of objects may be visually manipulated. Properties are also conveniently inspected. Properties of a field can be inspected, for instance, by clicking on it with the right mouse button* (Column 22, lines 31 – 34), which meet the limitation of **the property view displaying properties of the layout items.***

*Turpin et al. teach that *FIG. 15 illustrates the ability of the system of the invention to highlight the selected path in a tree for the user* (Column 17, lines 1 – 2), which meet the limitation of **the layout view displaying the layout items in their positions in the form.***

*Turpin et al. teach that *as shown in FIG. 37D, the value tree now shows a branch 631, but no condition or conclusion. A dotted rectangle surrounds the conclusion node, showing that it is selected* (Column 24, lines 59 – 61), which meet the limitation of **selecting a layout item in one of the logic, property, and layout views.***

*Turpin et al. teach that *the Form Tool lets the user select multiple objects in order to perform editing operations, assign or revise properties, or reposition the selected fields as a group of objects* (Column 6, lines 38 – 41), which meet the limitation of **modifying the selected layout item in one of the views.***

Turpin et al. teach that *FIG. 4 represents the major divisions of the "form image data file" which is generated during form creation* (Column 12, lines 63 – 64), which meet the limitation of **creating a form definition document based on the modified selected layout item.**

Turpin et al. do not explicitly teach **display labels, associated with the nodes, indicating structure information of the form; displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a layout view; continuously displaying and continuously highlighting the layout item as selected in one of the views other than the view in which the layout item was selected for the entire time that the layout item is selected.**

Eskridge et al. teach that in particular FIG. 1 shows a graphical embodiment of the user interface of this invention. Graphical user interface 2 includes graphical display area 20 (Column 6, lines 32 – 34 & Figure 1), which meet the limitation of **display labels, associated with the nodes, indicating structure information of the form.**

Eskridge et al. teach that in particular FIG. 1 shows a graphical embodiment of the user interface of this invention. Graphical user interface 2 includes graphical display area 20, filter area 50, display list area 30, and numerical display area ("NDA") 46 (Column 6, lines 32 – 36 & Figure 1), which meet the limitation of **displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a layout view.**

Eskridge et al. teach that if a user selects one of the components from filter area 50, the same component can be simultaneously highlighted in graphical display area 20, and in the current board results displayed in numerical display area 46, as shown in

FIG. 1. In this embodiment, the information shown in display list area 30 reflects the setting of the filter area 50 and will not be updated if the user selects a line in display list area 30. Thus, GUI 2 permits the user to simultaneously view the identified component, the graphical display of the component on the current board itself (Column 7, lines 65 – Column 8, line 2), which meet the limitation of **continuously displaying and continuously highlighting the layout item as selected in one of the views other than the view in which the layout item was selected for the entire time that the layout item is selected.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Turpin et al. with that of Eskridge et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Turpin et al. with a *user interface that dynamically links the information items displayed within different areas of the user interface such that a user can interact within one view area and simultaneously link to and/or update the corresponding information items in another view area* (Column 3, lines 56 – 61).

7. **Regarding dependent claims 19 and 20,** Turpin et al. teach that *both trees are made of nodes. There are branch nodes (restricted and unrestricted) and conclusion nodes. A restricted branch is simply a branch that is associated with a field; an unrestricted branch is not limited to values in a field. An empty node serves as a placeholder, indicating the absence of a tree or the lack of a conclusion after a branch. Every node has a condition except the root branch (the first branch). In a preferred*

*embodiment, a decision is made by reading trees from top to bottom and left to right. Thus, trees are read in much the same way one would read a flow chart: Is Quantity (branch) greater than 25 (condition)? If the answer is yes, then Shipping Method is Commercial carrier. If the answer is no, then evaluate the next condition (Column 22, lines 44 – 56), which meet the limitation of **the logic view comprises a tree view, and wherein the nodes are tree nodes, and the branch nodes include condition nodes to process layout items according to logical statements.***

8. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, Turpin et al. teach that *in accordance with the invention, keyboard entries are checked against "field characteristics" which are assigned to a field during form creation. If a keyboard entry for a field is not consistent with the assigned characteristic, the entered value is rejected and an error message advises the operator of a problem. Such characteristics can be assigned to a field by standard "picture" specifications. Alternatively, requirements for the form of a field input can be established by local form rules which are implemented by decision trees attached to the field. As an option, upon the occurrence of an error in input format, the field in error can be cleared and the prompt returned to that field to continue form completion (Column 4, lines 30 – 41), which meet the limitation of **verifying the compatibility of the layout items and the processing order with a predefined data interface of a business application.***

9. **Regarding dependent claim 22**, Turpin et al. teach that *an event tree for a form can initiate actions when a form is opened or closed. For example, a form event tree could have Close as a condition, and @PRINTFORM(FormName) as the conclusion. Every time a user closes that form, it would be printed. A form event tree could have Open as a condition, and @FIELDFIND(FieldName) as a conclusion. In this instance, every time a user opens that form, the specified field would be selected (Column 29, lines 47 – 54), which meet the limitation of **generating a form-printing program; and calling the form-printing program by a business application to print a final document based on the form definition document.***

10. **Regarding dependent claim 23**, Turpin et al. teach that *FIG. 15 illustrates the ability of the system of the invention to highlight the selected path in a tree for the user (Column 17, lines 1 – 2), which meet the limitation of **highlighting the selected layout item in at least one additional view.***

11. **Regarding claims 24 and 25**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 16 and 21 and are rejected along the same rationale.

12. **Regarding claims 26 – 30**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 16, 19 – 21 and are rejected along the same rationale.

13. **Regarding dependent claims 31 – 34**, Turpin et al. teach that *conclusion node: The ending segment of calculation logic that provides a value to the field. A conclusion node is indicated by an inverted triangle placed to the left of the conclusion expression* (Column 7, lines 14 – 17), which meet the limitation of **the nodes are shaped according to their function.**

14. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turpin et al. (US 5745712 A) and Eskridge et al. (US 6597381 B1) as applied to claim 16 above and further in view of Rivette et al. (US 6389434 A).

15. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, neither Turpin et al. nor Eskridge et al. explicitly teach **reflecting the modifications to the selected layout item in one of the views in which the modification was not made.**

Rivette et al. teach that, *the notes engine 306 links the selected portion of the data object to the new sub-note. In step 1818, the notes engine 306 updates the displays of the data object and the active note so as to graphically reflect this linkage. The notes engine 306 performs steps 1816 and 1818 in the manner shown in a flowchart 2102 of FIG. 21* (Column 30, lines 14 – 19), which meet the limitation of **reflecting the modifications to the selected layout item in one of the views in which the modification was not made.**

It would have been obvious to combine the invention of Turpin et al. and Eskridge et al. with that of Rivette et al. because such a combination would allow the

users of Turpin et al. and Eskridge et al. the benefit of *a system and method of linking notes to data objects* (Column 3, line 67).

16. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, Turpin et al. teach that *the Form Tool lets the user select multiple objects in order to perform editing operations, assign or revise properties, or reposition the selected fields as a group of objects* (Column 6, lines 38 – 41), which meet the limitation of **modifying the position of a layout item in the logic view, thereby changing the processing order**.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16 – 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NH


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100